

Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D),
this Memorandum Decision shall not be
regarded as precedent or cited before
any court except for the purpose of
establishing the defense of res judicata,
collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

JOSEPH F. THOMS
Thoms & Thoms
Indianapolis, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE:

STEVE CARTER
Attorney General Of Indiana

GARY DAMON SECREST
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

**IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

MATTHEW GORE,

Appellant-Defendant,

vs.

STATE OF INDIANA,

Appellee-Plaintiff.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 49A04-0612-CR-710

APPEAL FROM THE MARION SUPERIOR COURT
The Honorable Danielle Gaughan, Commissioner
Cause No. 49G16-0608-CM-150546

June 25, 2007

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

ROBB, Judge

Matthew Gore appeals his conviction of battery, a Class A misdemeanor, contending that his conviction is not supported by sufficient evidence. We affirm.

To convict Gore of battery as a Class A misdemeanor, the State was required to prove that Gore knowingly or intentionally touched Melissa Beard in a rude, insolent, or angry manner, causing bodily injury to Beard. Ind. Code § 35-42-2-1. Beard testified that when she and Gore were in bed, she moved as he took a drink of soda, causing him to spill the drink. Gore grabbed her by the ponytail and slammed her head into the nightstand, causing her pain and leaving her with a headache. This evidence is sufficient to support Gore's conviction of battery. See Mathis v. State, 859 N.E.2d 1275, 1281 (Ind. Ct. App. 2007) (sufficient evidence of battery where defendant pushed victim against door, pushed her onto sofa and laid on top of her, grabbed her hair and hit her in the head, causing her to "hurt" and "see stars"). Although Gore presented contrary evidence, it is the province of the trial court to resolve such conflicts; it is not for us to reweigh the evidence or judge the credibility of the witnesses. Jones v. State, 783 N.E.2d 1132, 1139 (Ind. 2003). To the extent Gore challenges Beard's testimony as "incredibly dubious," we note that nothing in her testimony was contradictory or equivocal, and there was no evidence her testimony was the result of coercion. See James v. State, 755 N.E.2d 226, 231 (Ind. Ct. App. 2001), trans. denied.

Affirmed.

SULLIVAN, J., and VAIDIK, J., concur.